General
Nine candidates sat the exam this cycle with 1 failure and an average pass mark of 49.7%.
The range of marks was 35% to 68%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of candidates</th>
<th>% mark</th>
<th>% candidates achieving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>22.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>22.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>44.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was evident from this year’s exam that the range of marks was lower than in previous years
resulting in the average mark being lower.

General comments:
Section A gave an average mark of 1.92 which was significantly lower than previous years. It was
evident from the exam papers that some candidates struggled with technical knowledge
in the subject area.
There was a significant difference between the average performance of candidates on
Sections B and C. Section B being the most poorly answered, particularly question 6 relating
to powers of the Animal Health Act 1981.
Exam technique and time management appeared to be an issue for some candidates, with
one candidate failing to complete the paper. One candidate answered 9 questions rather than
the 8 required, as such no marks would have been awarded for this additional question and
valuable time was therefore wasted.
As a reminder to candidates preparing for the November 2018 exam, ALL sections must be
attempted and the front of the exam paper provides guidance for candidates on the suggested
time allocation per section.
Rumbling on and trying to put everything one knows about a topic was again an issue for
some candidates, rather than being concise and answering the question asked. Whilst some
candidates deviated from the question asked, others failed to include sufficient information into
the answer, particularly where discussion into a subject was required.
Other areas of concern, as per previous years, included the lack of knowledge on
interpretation and powers and the citing of incorrect legislation, including a lack of reference to
the European legislation.
Good answers included reference to, and understanding of animal health case law.
Spelling and grammar were, on the whole, fine, though poor handwriting did make the marking
of some scripts extremely difficult.
Section A:
Q1. On the whole this question was answered reasonably well with an average mark of 2.4.
Whilst most candidates understood the difference between an infected premise, protection
zone and surveillance zone, it was concerning that candidates failed to state it was statute that
made a disease notifiable, notably the Animal Health Act 1981.
Q2. On the whole this question was answered poorly with an average mark of 0.5.
Candidates need to be comfortable with the interpretation of the law and this question sought
to obtain this. The Diseases of Swine Regulations 2014 include African swine fever, classical
swine fever and swine vesicular disease within the regulations. Candidates failed to answer
the question which related to the specific police powers under the regulations with a number of those sitting the exam citing powers of the police within the Animal Health Act 1981.

Q3. On the whole this question was answered reasonably well with an average mark of 2.0. This question related to the powers of an inspector cited in the Cattle Identification Regulations which most candidates had a basic knowledge on, though there was evidence of some confusion with powers from differing pieces of legislation that had not been requested.

Q4. On the whole this question was answered reasonably well with an average mark of 2.2 awarded.

Q5. This question was the best answered in Section A with an average mark of 2.5. Candidates appeared to have a reasonable understanding on the requirements of regulation 1/2005 and transport documentation, however scant answers on the requirements which lacked sufficient detail reflected in the average mark being lower than that expected.

Q6. This question was attempted by five candidates with an average mark of 8.2. There was evident disparity between candidates knowledge on answering this question with the lowest mark awarded being 6 and the highest mark being 14. Candidates failed to answer the question asked which was to discuss the powers of Section 63, 64 and 64a of the Animal Health Act 1981. It was evident from the answers that officers failed to understand the powers available and there was scant discussion with regards the effectiveness of the powers for disease control.

Q7. This question was attempted by five candidates with an average mark of 14 awarded. The question asked candidates to critically evaluate the role Local Authorities play in carrying out animal health and welfare duties. Candidates who answered this question on the whole had a good understanding of the landscape of animal health enforcement with the lowest mark achieved being 15 and the highest being 22 out of the possible maximum 25 marks available. Good answers included reference to the statutory requirements of the Animal Health Act 1981 compared to non-statutory legislation and the roles of others (including regulatory and voluntary bodies) within animal health.

Q8. This question proved popular with seven candidates attempting this question with an average mark of 14. This was a four part question and on the whole this question was answered well with candidates demonstrating that they had good practical knowledge on the subject area. Weakness was evident in understanding the legislative framework and powers of entry available to officers with only a couple of candidates making reference to the Animal Health Act 1981. Better answers included reference to BALAI agreements and offences potentially being committed under European legislation including Regulation 1/2005 on the Welfare of Animal in Transport.

Q9. This question proved the most popular with all 9 candidates choosing to attempt this question with an average mark of 14.1. This question related to the welfare of a pig that had been transported for slaughter. A number of candidates understood evidence gathering however only a couple made reference to case law (Leatherland and Pritchard v Powys County Council [2007]) that supported the need to retain the carcase / affected part of the carcase for examination by the defence to avoid abuse of process in any potential proceedings. Of concern was that no candidates identified the legal entities that may have committed offences and only a couple of candidates recognised that the driver may be liable for proceedings against them and ought to be treated as a defendant rather than a witness.

Q10. There were 2 candidates that answered this question with an average mark of 12. It was evident that one candidate ran out of time whilst completing this question and this would reflect in the marks awarded. A failure to answer the question asked did reduce marks, and as a reminder to all candidates, where a report format is requested, valuable marks may be lost if this is not the case. Whilst candidates showed limited understanding of disease control provisions, it was evident that some knowledge was lacking on the roles of those who have responsibility to deal with animal health emergencies, including local resilience and emergency planning.
It was of particular concern that no candidate made reference to the civil contingencies act or the LRF role and little reference was made to the role the industry play in controlling a disease outbreak, particularly as this has been referenced in a previous examiners report.